

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PCT/GB2005/000641

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC 7 H04M1/725 G06F17/30 G06F3/033

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

IPC 7 G06F H04M H04Q H04L

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal, WPI Data, PAJ, INSPEC

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category ^a	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	US 2002/196266 A1 (MOU MICHAEL ET AL) 26 December 2002 (2002-12-26)	1-3, 11-14, 22,23
Y	the whole document	4-10, 15-21
Y	----- US 2003/084121 A1 (DE BOOR ADAM ET AL) 1 May 2003 (2003-05-01) paragraphs [0022] - [0044]	4-10, 15-21
X	----- US 2003/013483 A1 (AUSEMS MICHIEL R ET AL) 16 January 2003 (2003-01-16) paragraphs [0056] - [0064]; figures 5,7	1,11,12, 22,23
A	----- EP 1 193 590 A (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) 3 April 2002 (2002-04-03) paragraphs [0011] - [0016] ----- -/-	1,12

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

^a Special categories of cited documents :

"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

"E" earlier document but published on or after the international filing date

"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)

"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means

"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.

"&" document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

27 May 2005

Date of mailing of the international search report

03/06/2005

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Bowler, A

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PCT/GB2005/000641

C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category °	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	EP 1 052 598 A (MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD) 15 November 2000 (2000-11-15) abstract; figure 4 -----	1,12
A	BICKMORE T ET AL: "WEB PAGE FILTERING AND RE-AUTHORING FOR MOBILE USERS" COMPUTER JOURNAL, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, SURREY, GB, vol. 42, no. 6, 1999, pages 534-546, XP000920338 ISSN: 0010-4620 the whole document -----	1-23

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PCT/GB2005/000641

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
US 2002196266	A1	26-12-2002	NONE	
US 2003084121	A1	01-05-2003	US 2002078143 A1	20-06-2002
			US 6317781 B1	13-11-2001
			US 6173316 B1	09-01-2001
			US 2004093376 A1	13-05-2004
			AU 3550399 A	25-10-1999
			DE 69901947 D1	01-08-2002
			DE 69901947 T2	23-01-2003
			EP 1152332 A2	07-11-2001
			EP 1152333 A2	07-11-2001
			EP 1070288 A1	24-01-2001
			HK 1033015 A1	28-02-2003
			JP 2002510819 T	09-04-2002
			WO 9952032 A1	14-10-1999
US 2003013483	A1	16-01-2003	NONE	
EP 1193590	A	03-04-2002	US 2002065110 A1	30-05-2002
			DE 01123600 T1	19-05-2004
			EP 1193590 A2	03-04-2002
EP 1052598	A	15-11-2000	CN 1274207 A	22-11-2000
			EP 1052598 A2	15-11-2000
			JP 2001028619 A	30-01-2001
			JP 2005092890 A	07-04-2005
			US 6674439 B1	06-01-2004

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: see form PCT/ISA/220		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)	
		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220			
International application No. PCT/GB2005/000641	International filing date (day/month/year) 21.02.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 19.02.2004	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04M1/725, G06F17/30, G06F3/033			
Applicant QUALCOMM CAMBRIDGE LIMITED			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application


2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:  European Patent Office - Gitschiner Str. 103 D-10958 Berlin Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0 Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840	Authorized Officer Bowler, A Telephone No. +49 30 25901-448
---	---



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/GB2005/000641

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/GB2005/000641

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	4-10,15-21
	No: Claims	1-3,11,12-14,22,23
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-23
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-23
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: US 2002/196266 A1 (MOU MICHAEL ET AL) 26 December 2002 (2002-12-26)
- D2: US 2003/084121 A1 (DE BOOR ADAM ET AL) 1 May 2003 (2003-05-01)
- D3: US 2003/013483 A1 (AUSEMS MICHIEL R ET AL) 16 January 2003 (2003-01-16)
- D4: EP-A-1 193 590 (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) 3 April 2002 (2002-04-03)
- D5: EP-A-1 052 598 (MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD) 15 November 2000 (2000-11-15)
- D6: BICKMORE T ET AL: "WEB PAGE FILTERING AND RE-AUTHORING FOR MOBILE USERS" COMPUTER JOURNAL, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, SURREY, GB, vol. 42, no. 6, 1999, pages 534-546, XP000920338 ISSN: 0010-4620

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-3, 11,12-14,22 and 23 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

2.1 Regarding claim 1, D1 discloses:

A method of displaying a subset of a plurality of user interface elements in a user interface, the method comprising the steps of:

(par. 002)

(I) determining the size of the subset of plurality of UI elements that can be displayed within the user interface;

(par. 021 counting the pixels; figure 5)

(ii) determining a plurality of UI elements that may be selected for display within the user interface;

(par. 020; figure 4)

(iii) selecting the subset of UI elements from the plurality of UI elements determined in step (ii); and

(par 05, a large animation is provided in the center of the monitor)

(iv) displaying the subset of UI elements selected

in step (iii) within the user interface.

(par. 05, Small icons are respectively displayed at the right side and the left side to that of the large animation.)

Thus, a subset of user interface elements is displayed on the user interface based upon the size of the elements and the size of the user interface.

2.2 Claim 12 is a corresponding device claim and as such is also not new.

2.3 As for claims 2, 13 the step of selecting is repeated and the display step is repeated, as the icons or the animation elements in D1 are progressively displayed on the interface screen in a rolling fashion. (see also steps 6 and 7 par. 023 and 024, where the plotting and storing of individual graphics is repeated such that the interface is set up for progressive rolling display.)

2.4 As for claims 3, 14 the scrolling of a list or menu is read as the progressive rolling of the animation objects in D1. (See par 005; "The primary purpose of the present invention is to provide a method of progressively rolling animation display on a cellular phone.")

2.5 Regarding claim 11, the method of D1 is disclosed as a program which comprises computer executable code.

2.6 Regarding claim 22, wireless communication means is read as the cellular phone of D1.

2.7 Claim 23 defines elements which are inherent to a cellular phone. (see par. 002).

3. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 4-10 and 14-21 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

3.1 Document D1 which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses a method for progressively displaying animation objects on a space limited interface such as that of a cellular phone as set forth above with respect to claims 1-3, 12-14, 11, 22 and 23. The subject-matter of claims 4-10 and 15-21 differs from D1 in that D1

fails to explain the details of the markup language and templates used in defining the user interface techniques of claims 1 and 12.

3.2 The subject-matter of claim 4-10 and 15-21 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

3.3 The problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as how to render the digital content from a web server on a small interface such as a hand held device or a cell phone. The solution is provided in D2. D2 discloses in great detail a man machine interface 102 on a wireless communications device 100 with a screen display 136. (Fig. 1)

3.4 The solution proposed in claim 4-10 and 14-21 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons.

3.5 Use of a markup language to define the location of the interface elements, build template based menus and lists and to render the interface content on the hand held display is described in document D2. See par 31-44. D2 is known to provide the same advantages as in the present application. The skilled person would therefore regard it as a normal /design/ option to implement the user interface using markup and template software as described in document D2. As such these claims are not seen to involve an inventive step.